UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,894	06/29/2001	Richard J. Folio	GCSD1173/232	1203

27975 7590 09/12/2002

ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A.
1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE
P.O. BOX 3791
ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791

EXAMINER
MCCHESNEY, ELIZABETH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2644	

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/896,894	Applicant(s) FOLIO, RICHARD J.
	Examiner Elizabeth A McChesney	Art Unit 2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on September 24, 2001 is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because in figure 1, the screen is illustrated incorrectly as 25a-26d wherein the specification, page 8, line 26, refers to the screen 24a-24d. Please make the appropriate corrections.

2. The drawings are objected to because in figure 2 the motion picture film 54a is illustrated incorrectly and should be shown as 34a. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "50a" has been used to designate both the clock in figure 3, referred to on page 12, line 2 and the movie patron unit in figure 2, referred to on page 11, line 21. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-13, 15-27, 29-43, 51-61 and 63-64** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karamon et al. (US Patent No. 5,055,939) in view of Oltman et al. (US Patent No. 5,822,440).

6. Regarding **claim 1**, Karamon et al. (hereinafter, "Karamon"), as discussed in the applicant's admitted prior art (page 2, lines 22-35), discloses auxiliary audio being synchronized with the conventional audio portion of the cinema. However Karamon discloses that this is available to segments of the cinema audience sitting in preselected seating areas. Wireless transmission of audio through the use of wireless transmitters and receivers as well as wireless headphones are all well known in the art. As taught by Oltman et al. (hereinafter, "Oltman"), persons attending concerts, shows, or speaking engagements in large halls or arenas (indoor as well as outdoor) which would include a movie cinema, are interested in have sound high sound quality delivered to their specific location (col. 1-lines 39-43). Oltman further discloses a wireless headphone system comprises of a transmitter and receiver, which utilizes an unlicensed frequency band, wherein, the transmitter broadcasts a Direct Sequence Spread Spectrum in order to avoid interference with other channels (col. 3-lines 33-39). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the wireless headphone system discloses by Oltman in system disclosed by Karamon which uses the auxiliary audio to allow the audience member to be seated wherever they desire instead of in preselected locations.

Regarding **claim 2**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Karamon further discloses the auxiliary source contains

multiple language channels or translation tracks, which includes an audio message carrying same information as in track of the motion picture (abstract). A language channel would therefore comprise of words and only words if so desired.

Regarding **claim 3**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Karamon further discloses the auxiliary may include one or more translation sound tracks for alternative language audio content (col. 1-lines 34-41).

Regarding **claim 4**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). The applicant's admitted prior art, page 3, lines 6-17, discloses supplemental audio content offered by TheatreVision wherein a track provides narration of what is being shown on screen.

Regarding **claim 5**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Oltman further discloses the modulation scheme used by the wireless transmitter and receiver as direct sequence spread spectrum (DSSS) and therefore inherently teaches a digital modulator which are well known in the art for minimizing interference with wireless transmissions (col. 3-lines 38-40).

Regarding **claim 6**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Oltman further discloses the modulation scheme used by the wireless transmitter and receiver as direct sequence spread spectrum (DSSS) (col. 3-lines 38-40).

Regarding **claim 7**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 6). Oltman further discloses the modulation scheme used by

the wireless transmitter and receiver as direct sequence spread spectrum (DSSS) (col. 3-lines 38-40).

Regarding **claim 8**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 6). Karamon and Oltman fail to specifically disclose or fairly suggest frequency hopping however, the Examiner takes Official Notice as the direct sequence and frequency hopping are the most commonly used methods for the spread spectrum technology. It would have been well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use frequency hopping for the purpose of hopping around within the band in order to avoid the jammer at some frequencies.

Regarding **claim 9**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Oltman further discloses a CDMA signal on several separate code channels wherein it is inherent that the channels would have been either user selectable or automatically selectable for the purposes of having an available channel for use (col. 3-lines 38-40).

Regarding **claim 10**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 9). It is inherent that the selectable channels are radio frequency channels.

Regarding **claim 11**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Oltman further discloses a wireless headphone system comprises a transmitter and a receiver, which utilizes an unlicensed frequency band (col. 3-lines 34-36) and which inherently teaches a radio frequency transmission.

Regarding **claim 12**, see Examiner's comments regarding claim 11.

Regarding **claim 13**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 11). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to operate in a designated band range for either an area allocated for service or an unlicensed area, which would therefore be an area not monitored and available to all.

Regarding **claim 15**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Oltman further discloses an associated pair of headphones per each receiver (col. 5-lines 44-46).

Regarding **claim 16**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). It would have been entirely obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have any type of volume control for the earphones as different forms of volume control are well known in the art and would have been obvious to include in this system as each person requires a different level of comfort for an optimum listening experience.

Regarding **claim 17**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). It would have been obvious to have at least one open field earphone, for example, the open air foam earphones which are in demand for various electronic device, for example, walkmans and disc-mans, to name a few. It is greatly desired to hear the background environment as well as the audio provided through the earphone instead of the closed earphone device in which it is difficult to hear any sort of background audio. Listeners would prefer to take advantage of the very expensive surround sound provided in present movie cinemas in addition to their supplemental

audio and do not wish to miss out on the theater ambience, of being part of the movie, a listener is exposed to within a cinema.

Regarding **claim 18**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Karamon further discloses a correlation system 17 which serves as the controller for the synchronization system 40 which includes signal processors, storage capability and a CPU to store the audio data and therefore synchronize the auxiliary audio with the original audio of the film (col. 12-lines 28-35).

7. Regarding **claims 19 and 32**, Karamon, as discussed in the applicant's admitted prior art (page 2, lines 22-35), discloses auxiliary audio being synchronized with the conventional audio portion of the cinema. However Karamon discloses that this is available to segments of the cinema audience sitting in preselected seating areas. Wireless transmission of audio through the use of wireless transmitters and receivers as well as wireless headphones are all well known in the art. As taught by Oltman et al. (hereinafter, "Oltman), persons attending concerts, shows, or speaking engagements in large halls or arenas (indoor as well as outdoor) which would include a movie cinema, are interested in have sound high sound quality delivered to their specific location (col. 1-lines 39-43). Oltman further discloses a wireless headphone system comprises of a transmitter and receiver, which utilizes an unlicensed frequency band, wherein, the transmitter broadcasts a Direct Sequence Spread Spectrum in order to avoid interference with other channels (col. 3-lines 33-39). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the

wireless headphone system discloses by Oltman in system disclosed by Karamon which uses the auxiliary audio to allow the audience member to be seated wherever they desire instead of in preselected locations. Oltman further discloses the modulation scheme used by the wireless transmitter and receiver as direct sequence spread spectrum (DSSS) and therefore inherently teaches a digital modulator which are well known in the art for minimizing interference with wireless transmissions.

Regarding **claims 20 and 33**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 19 and 32, respectively). Karamon further discloses the auxiliary source contains multiple language channels or translation tracks, which includes an audio message carrying same information as in track of the motion picture (abstract). A language channel would therefore comprise of words and only words if so desired.

Regarding **claims 21 and 34**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 19 and 32, respectively). Karamon further discloses the auxiliary may include one or more translation sound tracks for alternative language audio content (col. 1-lines 34-41).

Regarding **claims 22 and 35**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 19 and 32, respectively). The applicant's admitted prior art, page 3, lines 6-17, discloses supplemental audio content offered by TheatreVision wherein a track provides narration of what is being shown on screen.

Regarding **claims 23 and 36**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 19 and 32, respectively). Oltman further

discloses the modulation scheme used by the wireless transmitter and receiver as direct sequence spread spectrum (DSSS) (col. 3-lines 38-40).

Regarding **claims 24 and 37**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 19 and 32, respectively). Karamon and Oltman fail to specifically disclose or fairly suggest frequency hopping however, the Examiner takes Official Notice as the direct sequence and frequency hopping are the most commonly used methods for the spread spectrum technology. It would have been well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use frequency hopping for the purpose of hopping around within the band in order to avoid the jammer at some frequencies.

Regarding **claim 25**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 19). Oltman further discloses a CDMA signal on several separate code channels wherein it is inherent that the channels would have been either user selectable or automatically selectable for the purposes of having an available channel for use.

Regarding **claim 26**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 25). It is inherent that the selectable channels are radio frequency channels.

Regarding **claims 27 and 38**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 19 and 32, respectively). Oltman further discloses a wireless headphone system comprises a transmitter and a receiver, which

utilizes an unlicensed frequency band (col. 3-lines 34-36) and which inherently teaches a radio frequency transmission.

Regarding **claims 29 and 41**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 19 and 32, respectively). It would have been entirely obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have any type of volume control for the earphones as different forms of volume control are well known in the art and would have been obvious to include in this system as each person requires a different level of comfort for an optimum listening experience.

Regarding **claims 30 and 42**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 19 and 32, respectively). It would have been obvious to have at least one open field earphone, for example, the open air foam earphones which are in demand for various electronic device, for example, walkmans and disc-mans, to name a few. It is greatly desired to hear the background environment as well as the audio provided through the earphone instead of the closed earphone device in which it is difficult to hear any sort of background audio. Listeners would prefer to take advantage of the very expensive surround sound provided in present movie cinemas in addition to their supplemental audio and do not wish to miss out on the theater ambience, of being part of the movie a listener is exposed to within a cinema.

Regarding **claims 31 and 43**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claims 19 and 32, respectively). Karamon further discloses a correlation system 17 which serves as the controller for the synchronization

system 40 which includes signal processors, storage capability and a CPU to store the audio data and therefore synchronize the auxiliary audio with the original audio of the film (col. 12-lines 28-35).

Regarding **claim 39**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 38). Oltman further discloses the transmitter and receiver operates in an unlicensed frequency band (col.3-lines 35-36).

Regarding **claim 40**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 38). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to operate in a designated band range for either an area allocated for service or an unlicensed area, which would therefore be an area not monitored and available to all.

8. Regarding **claim 51**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 1. Since claim 51 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 1; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 1.

Regarding **claim 52**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 2. Since claim 52 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 2; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 2.

Regarding **claim 53**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 3. Since claim 53 discloses a method, which corresponds to,

the apparatus of claim 3; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 3.

Regarding **claim 54**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 4. Since claim 54 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 4; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 4.

Regarding **claim 55**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 5. Since claim 55 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 5; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 5.

Regarding **claim 56**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 6. Since claim 56 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 6; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 6.

Regarding **claim 57**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 7. Since claim 57 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 7; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 7.

Regarding **claim 58**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 8. Since claim 58 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 8; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 8.

Regarding **claim 59**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 9. Since claim 59 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 9; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 9.

Regarding **claim 60**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 10. Since claim 60 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 10; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 10.

Regarding **claim 61**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 11. Since claim 61 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 11; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 11.

Regarding **claim 63**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 16. Since claim 63 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 16; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 16.

Regarding **claim 64**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 17. Since claim 64 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 17; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. **Claims 14, 28, 44-50 and 62** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karamon et al. (US Patent No. 5,055,939) in view of Oltman et al. (US Patent No. 5,822,440) and in further view of Denenberg (US Patent No. 5,375,174).

10. Regarding **claim 14**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 1). Oltman fails to specifically disclose or fairly suggest infrared transmission. However, infra-red transmission is well known in the art as another form of wireless transmission. Denenberg discloses a wireless headset, capable of either radio frequency or infra-red transmission, which is feasible wherein the modulation scheme is digital spread spectrum. Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use infra-red communication for line of sight because it provides a higher bandwidth (col. 1-lines 46-47).

Regarding **claim 28**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 19). Oltman fails to specifically disclose or fairly suggest infrared transmission. However, infra-red transmission is well known in the art as another form of wireless transmission. Denenberg discloses a wireless headset, capable of either radio frequency or infra-red transmission, which is feasible wherein the modulation scheme is digital spread spectrum. Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use infra-red communication for line of sight because it provides a higher bandwidth.

Regarding **claim 44**, Karamon, as discussed in the applicant's admitted prior art (page 2, lines 22-35), discloses auxiliary audio being synchronized with the conventional audio portion of the cinema. However Karamon discloses that this is available to segments of the cinema audience sitting in preselected seating areas. Wireless transmission of audio through the use of wireless transmitters and receivers as well as wireless headphones are all well known in the art. As taught by Oltman et al. (hereinafter, "Oltman), persons attending concerts, shows, or speaking engagements in large halls or arenas (indoor as well as outdoor) which would include a movie cinema, are interested in have sound high sound quality delivered to their specific location (col. 1-lines 39-43). Oltman further discloses a wireless headphone system comprises of a transmitter and receiver, which utilizes an unlicensed frequency band, wherein, the transmitter broadcasts a Direct Sequence Spread Spectrum in order to avoid interference with other channels (col. 3-lines 33-39). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the wireless headphone system discloses by Oltman in system disclosed by Karamon which uses the auxiliary audio to allow the audience member to be seated wherever they desire instead of in preselected locations. Oltman fails to specifically disclose or fairly suggest infrared transmission. However, infra-red transmission is well known in the art as another form of wireless transmission. Denenberg discloses a wireless headset, capable of either radio frequency or infra-red transmission, which is feasible wherein the modulation scheme is digital spread spectrum (col. 1-lines 46-47).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use infra-red communication for line of sight because it provides a higher bandwidth.

Regarding **claim 45**, Karamon and Oltman in view of Denenberg discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 44). Karamon further discloses the auxiliary source contains multiple language channels or translation tracks, which includes an audio message carrying same information as in track of the motion picture (abstract). A language channel would therefore comprise of words and only words if so desired.

Regarding **claim 46**, Karamon and Oltman in view of Denenberg discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 44). Karamon further discloses the auxiliary may include one or more translation sound tracks for alternative language audio content (col. 1-lines 34-41).

Regarding **claim 47**, Karamon and Oltman in view of Denenberg discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 44). The applicant's admitted prior art, page 3, lines 6-17), discloses supplemental audio content offered by TheatreVision wherein a track provides narration of what is being shown on screen.

Regarding **claim 48**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 44). It would have been entirely obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have any type of volume control for the earphones as different forms of volume control are well known in the art and would have been obvious to include in this system as each person requires a different level of comfort for an optimum listening experience.

Regarding **claim 49**, Karamon in view of Oltman discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 44). It would have been obvious to have at least one open field earphone, for example, the open air foam earphones which are in demand for various electronic device, for example, walkmans and disc-mans, to name a few. It is greatly desired to hear the background environment as well as the audio provided through the earphone instead of the closed earphone device in which it is difficult to hear any sort of background audio. Listeners would prefer to take advantage of the very expensive surround sound provided in present movie cinemas in addition to their supplemental audio and do not wish to miss out on the sensation of being part of the movie a listener is exposed to within a cinema.

Regarding **claim 50**, Karamon and Oltman in view of Denenberg discloses everything claimed as applied above (see claim 44). Karamon further discloses a correlation system 17 which serves as the controller for the synchronization system 40 which includes signal processors, storage capability and a CPU to store the audio data and therefore synchronize the auxiliary audio with the original audio of the film (col. 12-lines 28-35).

Regarding **claim 62**, it is interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 14. Since claim 62 discloses a method, which corresponds to, the apparatus of claim 14; the method is obvious in that is simply provides functionality for the structure of claim 14.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth A. McChesney whose telephone number is (703) 308-4563. The examiner can normally be reached Monday – Friday, 8:00 am – 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W. Isen can be reached on (703) 305-4386.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

EAM EAM
September 3, 2002

FORESTER W. ISEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600